DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 183 EC 309 776

AUTHOR	Doyle, Lynn H.
TITLE	Inclusion: The Unifying Thread for Fragmented Metaphors.
PUB DATE	2003-04-23
NOTE	20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; Change Agents; *Disabilities; Educational Change; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inclusive Schools; Leadership Training; Models; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This paper examines new metaphors in educational leadership and how shifting priorities and contradictions between these metaphors could result in serious fragmentation within the field. It then discusses seven ways that inclusion of all students and, in particular, students with disabilities, is the unifying thread that weaves these metaphors together. It suggests that inclusion: (1) facilitates leadership for social justice; (2) models democracy; (3) shifts power; (4) involves school-wide reform; (5) restructures and recultures; (6) enhances strategies for teaching and learning; and (7) provides support and resources. Implications for the preparation of educational leaders suggest that inclusion requires dramatic shifts in perspective; inclusion shifts the problem of students with disabilities from the individual to social constructions; and that leadership is critical to the effectiveness of inclusive schools. It suggests that both administrators and teachers must reexamine their perspectives on separate professional preparation programs. It concludes that these programs should not only teach principles of inclusion but model them as well. (Contains 90 references.) (DB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 480 183

Inclusion: The unifying thread for fragmented metaphors

Lynn H. Doyle

Old Dominion University

Norfolk, Virginia

The fabric of educational leadership is changing. Murphy (2001) has suggested three new metaphors for educational leaders: moral stewards, builders of democratic leadership, and educators. However, shifting priorities and contradictions between these metaphors could result in serious fragmentation within the field. This article discusses seven ways that inclusion of all students, and in particular, students with disabilities, is the unifying thread that weaves these metaphors together. Inclusion (a) facilitates leadership for social justice, (b) models democracy, (c) shifts power, (d) involves school-wide reform, (e) restructures and recultures, (f) enhances strategies for teaching and learning, and (g) provides support and resources. Implications for educational leadership preparation are discussed.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of
The American Educational Research Association (AERA)
Chicago, Illinois
April 21-25, 2003

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Doyle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EC 309776

The challenges facing educational leaders today are considerable. They are, in fact so acute that the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) coordinated the establishment of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP). This commission was charged with four tasks: (a) understanding contemporary contextual factors that impact educational leaders and their preparation programs, (b) examining educational leadership preparation and professional development programs, (c) defining what needs to occur both within and outside of the university setting to ensure effective leadership training and professional development, and (d) developing action plans.

In a paper commissioned for the NCAELP, Murphy (2001) argues for new blueprints for the profession of educational leadership.[1] He reiterates his suggestion for three new anchors, social justice, democratic community, and school improvement, that he discussed in the UCEA Monograph, "Quest for a Center" (1999) and goes on to describe how, from these three anchors, three new understandings of leadership emerge: (a) leaders as moral stewards, (b) leaders as community builders, and (c) leaders as educators. To guide educational leaders in this journey, Murphy did not create new ideas but rather isolated dominant themes (which he called metaphors) from the current research literature. In so doing, he alerted educational leaders to their need to reculture—to change how they view the very foundation of their field.

Possibilities for Fragmentation

In his presentation of leaders as moral stewards, community builders, and educators, Murphy does not emphasize any one metaphor in particular nor explain how they overlap or interconnect. Each metaphor addresses an integral part of an interrelated process, a dynamic called educational leadership; however, each is discussed in isolation. Each metaphor represents a distinct line of inquiry. Because educational leaders clearly perceive differences in the importance of each metaphor, the potential for fragmentation within the field is high. Pauken, Kallio, and Stockard (2001) point out that some educational leaders view the moral implications of accountability and high stakes testing as unethical because it serves as another barrier to the success of disenfranchised students. By placing more weight on moral agency, these educational leaders conflict with others who emphasize educating for school improvement. In a key word search of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), I found that when the word "moral" was combined with "community," there were 609 hits; however when "moral" was combined with "school improvement," there were only 13 hits.[2] Slee and Weiner (2001) assert that researchers in school improvement and effectiveness have distanced themselves from controversies about education policies. They state:

> Knowing that schools are the site of systematic exclusion, the interrogation of the aims and form of schooling becomes one of the most pressing research agenda items. Inclusive schooling? Effective schooling? Our question remains on the table, school effectiveness for whom? (p. 95)

Diversity is critical to this discussion. As a central contemporary contextual factor that impacts education, understanding diversity is one of the most important tasks before the NCAELP. Diversity is considered of such importance for the nation's schools that it was the theme of the 2001 UCEA Convention. The Call for Proposals requested proposals that focused

on how schools can and must be attentive to "proliferating racial, cultural, socioeconomic and linguistic diversity" (UCEA, 2001, p. 22). However, ability, one of the most important differences in each of us was omitted in UCEA's description of diversity. Diversity of ability has been conceived as a separate system, a special one, and subsequently, many do not typically view ability as part of diversity nor see disability as part of school reform. While legislation makes it illegal to track students according to race, ethnicity, or gender, the foundational structures of public education have educators tracking students according to ability into special education, gifted and talented programs, Advanced Placement classes, criteria-based magnet schools, and so on.

In this paper, I suggest that inclusion of all students, but particularly those students with disabilities, is the necessary thread to defragment Murphy's foundational metaphors for educational leadership. Inclusion of special education students of varied abilities in regular classrooms requires the dramatic shifts in thinking, changes in school organization, and altered teaching that Murphy's metaphors intend. Despite its frequent exclusion from the conversation on diversity, inclusion of students with disabilities is actually the most powerful way to substantively alter perspectives and improve teaching and learning for all students. I begin this discussion by first clarifying the meaning of inclusion and then presenting seven ways in which inclusion of students with disabilities weaves together new roles for educational leaders who will serve as moral stewards, community builders, and educators. I conclude with implications for the field of educational leadership and its preparation programs.

Inclusion

While grouping students according to race, ethnicity, and gender has severe legal limitations, grouping students according to ability is a widely used practice for categorizing students (Capper, Frattura, & Keyes, 2000). Student tracking schemes and classification practices based on ability have been upheld in the courts provided they are not "ploy[s] to perpetuate discrimination" (McCarthy, Cambron-McCabe, & Thomas, 1998, p. 193). Special education is a form of tracking that has been institutionalized into the educational system through federal and state legislation. In fact, schools are not only allowed to categorize students into homogeneous groups of under-achieving students, they are also encouraged to do so by funding systems that allocate monies categorically.

The Education for All Handicapped Children's Act, passed in 1975, renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in 1990, provides funding to states that guarantee a free, appropriate public education to all students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Despite contradictions in IDEA (Doyle, in press), the act does provide what Starratt (2001) calls "encouragement" for Dewey's democracy because it ensues rights to students who had previously been denied. Similar to other civil rights legislation, the intention of this legislation moves public schools closer to democratic ideals. This became clearer in 1997 when the United States Congress reauthorized IDEA. Congress stated that students with disabilities must have more access to the general education curriculum and reforms. It also requires that more attention be paid to racial, ethnic, and linguistic diversity; focus on teaching and learning; and collaboration with parents (S. Rep. No. 105-17, 1997, p. 5). Congress expects positive outcomes for students with disabilities. Through the No Child Left Behind Act, signed

into law on January 8, 2002, Congress requires increased participation of students with disabilities in state and district assessments.

Through the 1997 reauthorization of IDEA, Congress clarified that least restrictive environment means the regular education curriculum (20 U.S.C. 1401 *et.seq.*). Congress clearly expects IEP committees, with regular classroom teachers as members, to include children with disabilities in the general curriculum. However, Congress muddies the waters because it continues to define least restrictive environment along a continuum of places that includes isolated settings (resource, separate classes, separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) in addition to the regular class. Therefore, while the intent may be inclusion, IDEA continues to allow exclusions.

While clarifying least restrictive environment, Congress does not define inclusion; it leaves that up to educators. Educators vary in their interpretations of inclusion. According to Zepeda and Langenbach (1999), inclusion is a "mind-set" (p. 203) about educating all students. It is "not just a place or a method of delivering instruction. It is a philosophy...[and] is part of the very culture of a school" (p. 204). Inclusion is an "issue of social justice as well as an issue of equity" (Gerrard, 1994, p. 66) that calls for changes in beliefs, structures, and the culture of schools.

Within the special education literature on inclusion lie two schools of thought: incremental and reconceptual (Andrews et al., 2000). Those individuals who hold an incrementalist view assert that inclusion should be a careful, step-by-step process of change (Kavale & Forness, 2000; Carnine, 1997; Kauffman, 1993). Incrementalists see the target of change as individuals with needs. The purpose is to ameliorate needs through interventions that have been validated through empirical research. Emphasis is on treatment methods.

Others, Andrews et al. (2000) explain, reconceptualize disability and see the target of change as the social construction of disability. This reconceptualist perspective on disability "focuses on racism, on systems, on researchers as change agents, and on the need to redefine moral and ethical behavior" (p. 260).[3] While the incremental perspective on inclusion centers on improvement, it does not provide the moral imperatives and opportunities to build democratic communities that are needed to connect Murphy's metaphors for educational leaders. Therefore, inclusion for this discussion is one that emerges from a reconceptualist perspective.

I now move to a discussion of seven specific ways in which inclusion for students with disabilities provides the power to weave together educational leaders as moral stewards, builders of democratic leadership, and educators (see figure 1). Inclusion (a) facilitates leadership for social justice, (b) models democracy, (c) shifts power, (d) involves school-wide reform, (e) restructures and recultures, (f) enhances strategies for teaching and learning, and (g) provides support and resources. In these ways, inclusion of students with disabilities has the potential to facilitate inclusion for students of all diversities.

[Insert figure 1 about here.]

Facilitates Leadership for Social Justice

Inclusion of students with disabilities provides the conditions for educational leaders to facilitate challenging dialogues about social justice in their schools. However, as mentioned, exclusion based on ability is frequently omitted from these conversations about social justice. While social justice might "never [be] fully realized or achieved either by definitions or our actions" (Bogotch, 2002, p. 139), interpretations of social justice are typically based on the equitable distribution of social goods that include education (Bell, Jones, & Johnson, 2002; Rice & Ebmeier, 2002) and that the exclusion of those goods is unjust when distribution is based on marginalizing conditions (Grogan, 2002). While the literature on leadership for social justice includes disability as a marginalized group, it has focused more on issues of race, ethnicity, gender, class, and/or sexual orientation (Grogan, 1999; Lugg & Koschoreck, 2003; Lyman & Villani, 2002; Marshall, 1993; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Riester, Pursch, & Skrla, 2002; Shakeshaft, 1999; Shields, Larocque, & Oberg, 2002; Young & Laible, 2000). Because individuals do not typically view exclusion based on ability in the same context as legally protected groups (race, ethnicity, and/or gender), inclusion provides an opportunity to extend the social justice dialogue. By concentrating on students with disabilities, educational leaders act as moral stewards and educators so that others see how isolating practices in the identification and placement of students in special education (Oakes, 1985; Riester, Pursch, & Skrla, 2002) and the existence of dual systems (regular and special education) may be in conflict with guiding principles of social justice (Capper, Frattura, & Keyes, 2000; Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Skrtic, 1991; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Thousand, Nevin, & McNeil, 2000).

Educational leaders who focus on exclusion based on ability facilitate dialogues on belief systems and how special education is based on the ideology of normalization (Macintosh, 2002; Skrtic, 1991). That ideology says that there is something wrong with certain individuals; they are defective or deviant and they must be fixed so that they can be normalized into the mainstream of society. Working from Foucault's theory of disability, McIntosh argues that a primary effect of categories of deviance is that through public exposure and categorization, individuals with disabilities—in this case, learning disabilities—are socially revealed and excluded. He states:

> [P]eople with learning disabilities now undergo assessment of their strengths, capabilities and weaknesses. Every deficiency is logged and plans are drawn up to correct this. The process is monitored and evaluated, the person a subject of social demand and professional obligation. Minutiae of lives and thought are explored, interpreted, and broadened to a wider audience. Sexual orientation and practices of the individual are observed, judged, monitored, restricted and discussed in 'open' forums such as case conferences…The lives of people with learning disabilities are played out publicly [while] we the seeing cannot be seen, our own lives played out in the shadow of privacy. (pp. 73-74)

Inclusion of students with disabilities provides opportunities for educational leaders to ask critical questions about ability grouping and tracking and how these structures flow from a normalization ideology. Although they have been institutionalized throughout American education, none of the assumptions used to support these structures withstood close examination of the research (Lindle, 1994). The only positive effect Lindle found was on the highest ability groups; however, these groups were also given an enriched curriculum and stimulating instruction

that therefore confounded findings. Others have concluded that homogeneous grouping has negative effects on students (Oakes, 1985; Sapon-Shevin, 1994).

Models "Thick" Democracy

When Murphy addresses community building, he does so in the context of democratic communities; however, interpretations of democratic differ. Elsewhere, I found that some administrators see the democratic process as isolated to shared decision making (Doyle, in press). Others argue that democracy involves both process and purpose (Quantz, Cambron-McCabe, & Dantley, 1991; Purple, 1988). Starratt (2001) argues that schools should use a "thick" definition of democracy, one that incorporates the idea that schools do more than develop skills and knowledge for the marketplace; more than what Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, and Tipton (1985) referred to as "utilitarian individualism." In a study of student perceptions of leadership, I found that middle school students perceived that leadership involved helping and caring (Doyle, 2001). However, their description of helping and caring lacked any signs of the collective ethic of care described by Noddings (1992). According to their school experiences, the reason that leaders help is so that each person can achieve for their individual ends.

A "thick" meaning of democracy challenges the appropriateness of separateness in a democratic society. Schools model the future beliefs and practices of all of their students. Therefore, if students observe other students being tracked in their schools, i.e., for special education programming, it is logical to assume that they too will discriminate and isolate individuals with disabilities in the future. One student I interviewed Doyle, 2001) said, "We act like what the teachers expect, and we act like they act too, and I think we'd do the same for the principal too" (p. 533).

Edgar (1997) states, "Schools are the primary societal institution for preparing people to transition from the smaller communities of family and friends to the community of the whole (p. 324). The problem is "how to teach people from diverse backgrounds how to get along together with equity and justice" (p. 324). Inclusion does this by going beyond talking about social justice; it shows how. Current practices of tracking communicate that it is morally acceptable for schools to isolate groups of students. While students may discuss issues of equity in their classrooms, at the same time, they see students categorized and treated separately in their day-to-day school lives. Inclusion models a new and powerful message. It shows students that while their schools are legally prohibited from segregating according to race, ethnicity, or gender, they have voluntarily stopped segregating according to ability.

Shifts Power for Community Building

Murphy suggests the community builders metaphor to replace the organizational leaders metaphor.[4] Since the organization metaphor has been woven throughout the history of the field, what Murphy asks is no small task. Leadership that moves toward building schools as communities is quite different than the leadership used by principals who manage the day-to-day operations of school organizations and is interpreted in different ways. For example, Furman-Brown (2000) found that the term "community" is used 33 times in the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. While the framers of these standards may have envisioned communities for school improvement, Furman-Brown's analysis led her to conclude

that community, as defined in these standards, is characterized by social control and contradictions.

As discussed, building democratic community involves both cultivating a moral purpose and assuring processes that shift power. Changing the metaphor to democratic community builder changes the role of the principal from sole decision maker to facilitator of shared decision making that goes beyond simply collecting input or voting on options. Leaders who shift power recognize that input, voting, and authentic decision making are very different processes and authentic decision making that shares ownership for decisions is the only process that models "thick" democracy. Educational leaders who understand democratic community empower teachers by "providing a forum for the development of ideas" (Hunt, Hirose-Hatae, Doering, Karasoff, & Goetz, 2000, p. 315). They stimulate inquiry, critique, innovation, and risk-taking (Reitzug, 1994). They facilitate dialogue in which people attempt to understand the ideas of others rather than convince others to accept their ideas. These educational leaders facilitate discussion of difficult issues of how inclusion of students with disabilities fits into their plan for social justice and how inclusion encourages learning communities for both students with and without disabilities (Falvey, Blair, Dingle, & Franklin, 2000; Ferguson, 1996).

Changing how one views power is inherent in the laws that govern how schools interact with students with disabilities. Although, most importantly, inclusion empowers students by not separating them from their peers, it also provides mechanisms that shift power through defined procedures. The process of developing an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) is a democratic one that can serve as a model for many (if not all) students. The IEP process communicates democratic messages to participants and observers by showing how roles can be shared and hierarchies dissolved. The power for the student's program is in the hands of teams that must collaborate in decisions. There is strong evidence to conclude that when educators, support personnel, and families are empowered to make collaborative decisions, the needs of students with disabilities can be effectively met in inclusive settings (Thousand & Villa, 2000; Udvari-Solner & Keyes, 2000). The IEP process communicates that all participants, including parents/guardians should have voice in a process in which all are experts and decision makers not only because that is what Congress intends, but because that is how it ought to be (Sailor, 1991; Skrtic, Sailor, & Gee, 1991).

Recent efforts in educational reform emphasize collaboration and teaming. Through IEP committee interactions, team members learn that conflict is a part of community that can be managed and/or resolved. Educational leaders help team members understand that their role in the IEP process is not an adversarial one with representatives of the school district on one side and parents/guardians on the other. For example, at an IEP meeting that I attended (Doyle, 2002a), the parents questioned the language used in their child's reports. Tension mounted, but as the representatives from the school district engaged the parents in constructive dialogue, they also communicated to them that they were equal members of the team. Tensions subsided, trust increased, and resolution was reached.

Combining inclusion with Murphy's metaphor of schools as democratic communities shifts power by allowing all participants to become advocates for students. When schools are viewed as organizations, educators are placed into channels in which they are gatekeepers of programs instead of providers of services. In democratic communities, professional advocacy on behalf of

students is viewed not as "aberrant radical behavior (Fiedler, 2000) but rather, "behavior that fulfills a professional ethical obligation" (p. 5).

Involves School-wide Reform

The third anchor suggested by Murphy (2001) is school improvement with "educators" as the metaphor for leadership. School improvement means changing or reforming what occurs in schools to improve teaching and learning. While the terms school effectiveness and school improvement are often used interchangeably, Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001) contrast the research in school effectiveness with school improvement concluding that the former examines what effective schools look like while the latter investigates how schools improve over time. The focus of the school improvement research is on the change process. School improvement includes how schools set their directions, identify goals and priorities, allocate resources, implement their goals, and assess progress. According to these definitions, inclusion of students with disabilities is school improvement.

Inclusion is a school-wide reform that integrates programs and blends resources so that all students benefit from specialized services. Unfortunately, there has been insufficient alignment of inclusion with other school reforms (Capper, Theoharis, & Keyes, 1998; Hunt, Hirose-Hatae, Doering, Karasoff, & Goetz, 2000) when it should have been used to inspire reform (Sapon-Shevin, 1996). Knoster, Villa, and Thousand (2000) call for educational leaders to view inclusion as comprehensive systemic reform. When inclusion is viewed as an add-on rather than the driving force for reform, schools meet limited success (Council for Exceptional Children, 1994) and opportunities for total school improvement are lost.

The changes in the 1997 reauthorization of IDEA are a "synergy" (Gartner & Lipsky, 2000, p. 38) that move special education toward transformation. The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources Report highlighted that the "legislation substantially streamlines the current data collection requirements" (S. Rep. No. 105-17, 1997, p. 35). This simplification provides states and local districts with considerably more latitude and indicates Congress's commitment to change. Provisions such as these provide opportunities for state departments of education and local school districts to look at past practices differently and create new opportunities that focus more on teaching and learning.

The research on inclusion of student with disabilities combined with the research on reform and school improvement can provide a strong knowledge base for educational leaders. Much can be learned about the leadership that is needed for school improvement from the school reform literature (Cunningham & Cordeiro, 2000). Mayrowetz and Weinstein (1999) state that "inclusion, at its core, is a planned organizational reform, [and] the literature on leadership for change should provide guidance" (p. 424). Capper, Theoharis, and Keyes (1998) linked the literature on school reform to inclusion concluding that leaders holding a vision for inclusion gain a "dedication to empowerment" from the literature on democratic leadership, and the knowledge on "how to create and sustain change" from the literature on reform and school improvement (p. 34).

Restructures and Recultures

Efforts to improve schools include comprehensive efforts that restructure and/or reculture.

Restructuring changes school structures, but restructuring alone has been called insufficient and incapable of making lasting change (DuFour, 1995). Reculturing, on the other hand, targets the meaning of schools by focusing on self-assessment, building capacity, and reflection. Fullan (1993) contends that when reculturing occurs, restructuring follows; however the converse is not always true. Murphy (2001) suggests that "a key to reculturing is changing the taproot of the profession from management to education" (p. 10).

Leaders who focus on how to do inclusion are managers; leaders who focus on attitudes, beliefs, and capacity are what Murphy calls "educators." Leaders in successful, inclusion programs connect visions to actions (Malarz, 1996). They confront both the "technical problems" and "cultural politics" in their schools (Slee & Weiner, 2001, p. 94). In other words, they both restructure and reculture their schools. In an investigation of reculturing in schools attempting comprehensive reform programs, Wonycott-Kytle and Bogotch (2000) isolated six functions for change: reflection and inquiry, strong teacher collaboration, altered teacher tasks, extrinsic incentives, comprehensive development activities, and changed administrator roles. When inclusion of students with disabilities is viewed as whole school reform, leaders assure that they incorporate each of these reculturing functions (Doyle, 2002b).

Recent school improvement initiatives attempt to restructure teaching and learning through high stakes testing. The 1997 reauthorization of IDEA and passage of No Child Left Behind mandate that special education students be included in these tests. While these mandates pose challenges and hardships for schools, they stop practices that allowed educators to circumnavigate congressional intentions. For example, prior to the 1997 reauthorization of IDEA, schools could improve their overall performance by classifying failing students as special education thereby exempting them from high stakes testing. Grade retention practices allowed schools to delay high stakes testing for failing students who were to be tested in the next target year. No Child Left Behind closes this loophole by requiring annual testing.

Tying test scores to their roles as moral stewards and community builders poses difficult challenges for educational leaders; however, testing has high potential to modify instructional strategies that can benefit all students particularly students at-risk for learning difficulties (Darling-Hammond, 1991). Capper, Hafner, and Keyes (2001) recognize the problems associated with high stakes testing of students with disabilities but suggest that educational leaders use multiple perspectives to view this as an opportunity to assess their own performance, ask new questions, and create possibilities for both regular and special education students.

Although both regular and special educators understand assessment and testing, they look at them from different perspectives: one from the large group; the other from individual needs and accommodations. Since the passage of No Child Left Behind, the interdependence of these two fields becomes more critical. Inclusion ties regular and special educators together to improve classroom teaching and establish appropriate testing accommodations for students. In doing this, they move schools closer to including all students.

Enhances Strategies for Teaching and Learning

School improvement challenges educators to change the way they teach. But instructional practices are resilient to change. Despite monumental shifts in theories of instruction, classroom teaching has a "pitiful history" for change (Cuban, 1993). Although students, society, curriculum,

and teachers have changed dramatically over the past thirty years, instruction continues in much the same way as it always has (Grubb, 1995). Teachers teach in classrooms that are organized by grade and ability levels and use instructional methods that are teacher directed and locked into subject areas.

Inclusion of students with disabilities infuses new strategies and thinking into classrooms. Educational leaders who act as Murphy's "educators" help others understand that teaching strategies previously used with groups of students at either end of the academic achievement continuum (i.e., students with disabilities and high achieving students) can be used successfully with students in the middle of the continuum as well (Giangreco, Clooninger, Dennis, & Edelman, 2000). All students can benefit from various strategies that were once thought to be within the domain of a particular group.

Over the years, regular educators have accumulated a knowledge base and developed skills that dramatically alter classroom teaching. For example, peer-tutoring models have been developed that go beyond merely pairing students and now incorporate whole classroom procedures (Cross & Walker-Knight, 1997; Downing & Eichinger, 1996). Some teachers now use cooperative learning strategies (Slavin, 1991) in place of large group instruction. Several school-wide structures that change instruction include block scheduling, looping, extended school year, schools-within-schools, heterogeneous grouping, interdisciplinary teaching units, and co-teaching.

At the same time, special educators have also accumulated a knowledge base and developed skills to identify and work with unique and individual needs. Special education teachers determine students' individualized behavior and learning styles based on individual responses to environment, emotional characteristics, physiological characteristics, and/or processing abilities. They have extensive knowledge and experience in writing goals, objectives, strategies, and assessment for individualized plans that incorporate supplemental aids, related services, and assistive technology. Special educators have experience in modifying content, specializing teaching strategies (Council for Exceptional Children, 2002), and utilizing community-based services (Hunt et al., 2000). Much can be gained from the joining of these two fields.

Provides Resources and Support

Inclusion requires that educators recreate how they use resources. As mentioned, individuals holding a reconceptualist view of inclusion argue that the current system is broken because it fails to recognize broader issues of diversity. Therefore, they argue resources should be allocated in ways that address systemic reform (Andrews et al., 2000). To focus only on effective instructional strategies, as the incrementalists suggest, is a constricted and narrow view of the problem. Thus, many inclusionists assert that special education resources should be merged with those in regular education (Burrello, Lashley, & Beatty, 2001; Capper et al., 2000; Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Sailor, 1991; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Villa & Thousand, 2000).

Recent changes in legislation move education closer to doing what these reformers suggest. The 1997 reauthorization of IDEA allows schools to blend Title I money for school-wide programs with IDEA funds and other federal money. This mechanism provides flexibility for schools to restructure and reculture their entire programs and increase the achievement of all students. The passage of No Child Left Behind continues resource allocations along this path.

When inclusion is recognized as a comprehensive school-wide reform program rather than an add-on, schools can seek money reserved for school-wide reform efforts.

Although these changes along with additional local initiatives toward site based management, allow educators in schools considerable autonomy in how they allocate resources, they do not take advantage of these opportunities. Odden and Archibald (2001) assert that this is because they continue to view staff in traditional roles. The effect is that schools merely reallocate "paltry nonstaff funds" and do not substantively alter the roles of personnel. Odden and Archibald state that this is merely a

> psychological constraint to envisioning the wide range of possibilities for different use of school resources...[and] can be diminished by actions that allow sites to view school resources as more discretionary. (p. 61)

When educational leaders "reposition leading from management to learning" (Murphy, 2001, p. 10), they help others see the countless ways that individual schools can decide to reallocate resources (Miles & Darling-Hammond, 1998). Changes in Title I funding and special education waivers that support inclusion encourage schools to rethink the roles of teachers, specialists, aides, and others. The literature contains numerous suggestions and teaching designs that integrate related services into classrooms (Capper et al., 2000; Giangreco, Cloninger, & Iverson, 1998; Giangreco, Edelman, Luiselli, & MacFarland, 1998). In these designs, the educational classroom goals become primary. For example, the speech pathologist, occupational and physical therapist, or school psychologist support teachers for whole classroom teaching when they work as collaborative team members. The purpose of support services becomes achieving educational goals, not adding complex, specialized targets that confuse rather than relate to the goals of the classroom. When resources and supports are reallocated for the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular education classrooms, many benefit.

Discussion and Implications

The tasks facing the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation are immense, but they also hold the capacity to make powerful changes in the field of educational leadership that could improve the future of many students. The contemporary contextual factors before the commission are complex. To facilitate in these tasks, Murphy (2001) suggests three new metaphors for educational leaders: moral stewards, democratic community builders, and educators for school improvement. While Murphy's metaphors have the potential to jolt educational leadership out of its current path, they also continue the fragmentation that is currently evident in the literature. Inclusion is the thread to weave these interrelated but potentially divisive concepts together. In this paper, I assert that inclusion of students with disabilities has the power for far-reaching inclusion of all groups. It facilitates social justice by providing the moral ground to alter perspectives and beliefs. It builds community by modeling democracy and providing structures that shift power. Inclusion inspires school improvement reforms that restructure and reculture. It enhances strategies for teaching and learning and provides resources and supports for reforms that are school-wide.

Murphy's metaphors woven into the fabric of inclusion present a new way of thinking in educational leadership and as a result, have significant implications for how preparation programs might look in the future. To accomplish what Murphy suggests, preparation programs will not

only have to reconceptualize how they think about educational leadership, but correspondingly, they must reorganize the way that they prepare others to do so. In other words, they need to prepare future educational leaders to reculture schools, but in the process, they must also reculture themselves.

Inclusion requires dramatic shifts in perspective. Educators of today frequently state that their schools are for "all students;" however, because of the way we conceive of the purpose of schools, "all students" can be contrived. Elaborate formal structures and tracking programs isolate students with disabilities from their peers. Despite years of discussion, many principals continue to confuse various service delivery models and levels referring to any minimal attempt at mainstreaming as inclusion (Doyle, 2002b). Inclusion is perceived as a hodgepodge of service delivery models rather than a fundamental moral purpose. Preparation programs that are built on a foundation of inclusion have the potential to change that.

Inclusion of students with disabilities challenges the normalization ideology by shifting the problem from the individual to social constructions. Inclusion values the differences in each individual and considers those differences as part of a democratic society. The purpose of normalization is to change individuals; the purpose of inclusion is to assist all individual students while improving society by fostering care, adaptability, and inclusiveness. When administrators alter their perspectives of disability, they focus practices and resources on both the structures and the cultures of their inclusionary schools.

Leadership is critical to the effectiveness of schools (Edmonds, 1986) and particularly to the success of inclusion (Rossman, 1992; Stainback & Stainback, 1991; Villa, Thousand, Meyers, & Nevin, 1996). One of the most definitive indicators for successful inclusion of students with disabilities is the belief that school administrators hold about inclusion (Rude & Anderson, 1992). Despite the critical role that administrators play in the success of inclusion, they vary widely in their attitudes and beliefs (Downing, Eichinger, & Williams, 1997; Kavale & Forness, 2000). It is discouraging to find that many school administrators see the problems of students with disabilities as outside of their school's sphere of influence (Allington, McGill-Franzen & Schick, 1997). In an investigation of principals' philosophies and practices, Bailey and du Plessis (1997) found that principals accept the concept of inclusion and "talk the high road of inclusion" (p. 438), but do not walk the talk. Their practices are often "at odds with their philosophy" (p. 437). Preparation programs that tie inclusion to Murphy's moral stewardship build awareness of the negative impact this behavior has on students, faculties, the school community, and culture. When administrators see themselves as moral stewards, they also see that when they camouflage inconsistent practices, they are acting in contradiction to their moral roles.

Inclusion requires that both administrators and teachers reexamine their perspectives on separate programs. Underlying Murphy's moral stewardship is the assumption that first, educational leaders hold strong beliefs for social justice themselves before they can steward for others. Their preparation programs will need to help them achieve both of these requisites. However, because of conflicting perspectives on educational leadership, this will be a struggle. For example, Bogotch (2002) explains that leadership for social justice emerges from two perspectives. Holding what Bogotch calls a "community perspective" on leadership for social justice, some leaders facilitate opportunities to create meanings of social justice. They do not direct and supervise but rather, they create empowering environments. These community-oriented

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

leaders engage teachers in discussion about the meaning of social justice and how ability fits into that meaning. Other administrators work from an "individual perspective" of social justice. They hold strong visions themselves, and then, acting "heroically," they motivate others to buy into their visions. Through their inspiration, these leaders steward social justice by garnering enthusiasm for visions and/or inclusionary programs, methods, and strategies. Individuals involved in the preparation of future educational leaders need to understand these critical differences as they transform their programs. They must be mindful of various purposes and associated processes as they facilitate these in their programs.

Many aspiring educational leaders are told during their preparation that they should be socially just in their schools. Perhaps they are even shown through case studies and enactments how the dilemmas of distributing justice play out in schools. However, are these strategies teaching the processes needed? Horn (2001) says they are not. He asserts that too often, educational leadership preparation programs, despite their attempts to use innovative teaching strategies and methods, actually reproduce the status quo. Preparation programs focus on factors of control rather than on moral awareness as the critical outcome. Horn states:

> Unfortunately, despite the use of innovative training techniques, many preparation programs mirror the conditions in their students' school communities. Innovations that are embraced lose much of their innovative potential because of the context in which they are placed. If students are taught to critically reflect and dialogue but are limited in their use of those techniques because of the content of their course or preparation program, the students learn that there are limits to the appropriateness of these innovations.... [This] allows the students to justify similar action in their own schools. To fully understand the origins of the less desirable types of cultures in schools, one needs to look at the culture promoted by educational leadership preparation programs. These programs are complicit in education's inability to create just and caring school communities. (pp. 324-325)

In other words, preparation programs should practice what they preach. We need to not only talk about reconceptualizing leadership, but also model it throughout our programs and teaching environments.

As we plan preparation programs, we must focus on the outcomes aspiring educational leaders will need. Throughout this paper, I have discussed how inclusion provides the opportunities to address those needs. Educational leaders will need to understand the socio-political context of inclusion and be able to determine where their schools are situated in this context. They will need to be prepared to focus on the intentions of educational legislation in place of narrow translations. As moral stewards, they will need to be committed to social justice and equity for all students, able to reflect on moral implications of what ought to be, and outraged by directives and practices that conflict. As builders of democratic communities, these educational leaders will need to put their beliefs into practice by shifting power. Builders of democratic communities recognize the inherent conflict between democracy and normalization practices and how American schools tell students that democracy means inclusion for all, but practices that categorize by ability show them otherwise. As educators for school improvement for all students, educational leaders will need to focus on teaching and learning through school-wide reform and see accountability measures as one more opportunity to reveal new possibilities. They will need to be able to educate their staffs in learner-centered instruction with teachers using differentiated

instructional strategies that meet the needs of each student. To support those goals, they will need to rethink how to use fiscal and human resources.

Weaving inclusion throughout suggested metaphors for educational leadership unifies these metaphors so that they can be considered as foundations for the field. By focusing on inclusion of students with disabilities, educational leaders thread together their sometimes divergent priorities and contradictory roles. From there, planners can create preparation programs that not only tell students about their moral, democratic, and educational roles, but model them as well.

References

Allington, R., McGill-Franzen, A., & Schick, R. (1997). How administrators understand learning difficulties: A qualitative analysis. *Remedial and Special Education, 18*(4), 223-232.

Andrews, J., Carnine, D., Coutinho, M., Edgar, E., Forness, S., Fuchs, L., Jordan, D., Kauffman, J., Patton, J., Paul, J., Rosell, J., Rueda, R., Schiller, E., Skrtic, T., & Wong, J. (2000). Bridging the special education divide. *Remedial and Special Education, 21*(5), 258-260, 267.

Bailey, J. & du Ploessis, D. (1997). Understanding principals' attitudes towards inclusive schooling. *Journal of Educational Administration, 35(*5), 428-438.

Bell, G., Jones, E., & Johnson, J. (2002. School reform: Equal expectations on an uneven playing field. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(3), 317-336.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A. & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life.* New York: Harper Collins.

Bogotch, I. E. (2002). Educational leadership and social justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(2), 138-156.

Burrello, L., Lashley, C., & Beatty, E. (2001). *Educating all students together: How school leaders create unified systems.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Capper, C. A., Frattura, E., and Keyes, M. W. (2000). *Meeting the needs of students of ALL abilities: How leaders go beyond inclusion.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Capper, C. A., Hafner, M. M., & Keyes, M. (2001). Moving beyond "good/bad" student accountability measures: Multiple perspectives of accountability. *Journal of School Leadership 11*(3), 204-216.

Capper, C. A., Theoharis, G. T., and Keyes, M. W. (1998). *The principal's role in inclusive schools for students with disabilities, empowering and democratic schools, and restructuring schools: A comparative analysis.* Paper presentated at the University Council for Educational Administration. October 30-November 1, St. Louis, Missouri.

Carnine, D. (1997). Bridging the research-to-practice gap. In J. Lloyd, E. Kameenui, & D. Chard (Eds.). *Issues in educating students with disabilities* (pp. 363-373). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Council for Exceptional Children (1994). *Creating schools for all our students.* Reston, Virginia: Author.

Council for Exceptional Children (2002). *To light a beacon: What administrators can do to make schools successful for all students.* Arlington, Virginia: Author

Cross, L. & Walker-Knight, D. (1997). Inclusion: Developing collaborative and cooperative school communities. *The Educational Forum, 61*(Spring),269-277.

Cuban, L. (1993). The lure of curricular reform and its pitiful history. *Phi Delta Kappan,*

October, 182-185.

Cunningham, W. C. & Cordeiro, P. (2000). *Educational administration: A problem-based approach.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). The implications of testing policy for quality and equality. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73,* 220-225.

Downing, J. (Ed.) (1996). *Including students with severe and multiple disabilities in typical classrooms: Practical suggestions for teachers.* Baltimore: Brookes.

Downing, J., Eichinger, & Williams, L. (1997). Inclusive education for students with severe disabilities: Comparative views of principals and educators at different levels of implementation. *Remedial and Special Education, 18*(3), 133-142, 165.

Doyle, L. H. (2001). Kids Say–and Don't Say–"The Darndest Things" about School Leadership. *Journal of School Leadership 11*(6), 511-535.

Doyle, L. H. (2002a). Leadership and special education: A study of power shifts. *Journal of School Leadership 12*(1), pp. 23-56.

Doyle, L. H. (2002b). Leadership and inclusion: Reculturing for reform. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 11*(1), pp. 38-62.

Doyle, L. H. (in press). Democratic leadership and students with disabilities: Discordant conversations, but not incompatible. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory & Practice.*

DuFour, R. (1995). Restructuring is not enough, *Educational Leadership* 52(4), 33-36.

Edgar, E. (1997). School reform, special education, and democracy. *Remedial and Special Education, 18*(6), 323-325.

Edmonds, R. (1986). Characteristics of effective schools., In U. Neisser (Ed.), *The school achievement of minority children: New perspectives* (pp. 93-104). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Falvey, M. A., Blair, M. Dingle, M. & Franklin, N. (2000). Creating a community of learners with varied needs. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 186-207). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Ferguson, D. L. (1996).I Is it inclusion yet" Bursting the bubbles. In M. S. Berress, D. L. Ferguson, P. Knoblock, & C. Woods (Eds.), *Creating tomorrow's schools today: Stories of inclusion, change, and renewal* (pp. 16-37). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fiedler, C. R.(2000). *Making a difference: Advocacy competencies for special education professionals.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces.* Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Furman-Brown, G. (2000). The ISLLC rendition of community: Contradiction and control? Paper presentation at the University Council for Educational Administration. November 3-5, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. *Harvard Educational Review,* 57(4), 367-395.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (2000). Inclusion and school restructuring: A new synergy. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 38-55). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Gerrard, L. (1994). Inclusive education: An issue of social justice. *Equity & Excellence in*

Education, 27(1), 58-67.

Giangreco, M., Clooninger, C., Dennis, R., & Edelman, S. (2000). Problem-solving methods to facilitate inclusive education. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 293-327). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Giangreco, M., Cloninger, C., & Iverson, V. (1998). *Choosing outcomes and accommodations for children: A guide to educational planning for students with disabilities (2nd ed.)*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Giangreco, M. , Edelman, S., Luiselli, T., & MacFarland, 1998). Reaching consensus about educationally necessary support services: A qualitative evaluation of VISTA. *Special Services in the Schools,* 13(1-2), 1-32.

Glickman, C. D, Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2001). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach.* (5th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Grogan, M. (1999). Equity/equality issues. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *35*(4), 518-536.

Grogan, M. (2002). Guest editor's introduction: Leadership for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(2), 112-115.

Grubb, W. N. (1995). The old problem of "new student": Purpose, content and pedagogy. In E. Flaxman & A. H. Passow (Eds.), *Changing populations changing schools* (pp. 4-29). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Horn, R. A. (2001). Promoting social justice and caring in schools and communities: The unrealized potential of the cohort model. *Journal of School Leadership, 11*(4), 313-334.

Hunt, P. Hirose-Hatae, A., Doering, K., Karasoff, P., & Goetz, L. (2000). "Community" is what I think everyone is talking about. *Remedial and Special Education, 21*(5), 305-317.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1401 *et.seq.*

Kauffman, J. (1993). How we might achieve the radical reform of special education. *Exceptional Children, 60*, 6-16.

Kavale, K. & Forness, S. (2000). History, rhetoric, and reality: Analysis of the inclusion debate. *Remedial and Special Education, 21*(5), 279-296.

Knoster, T. P., Villa, R. A. & Thousand, J. S. (2000). A framework for thinking about systems change. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 93-128). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Larson, C. L. & Murtadha, K. Leadership for social justice. In J. Murphy (Ed.), The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century: 101st yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 134-161). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lindle, J. (1994). Review of the Literature on Tracking and Ability Grouping. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED384643).

Lugg, C. A. & Koschoreck, J. W. (2003). Special issue: The final closet. *Journal of School Leadership 13*(1).

Lyman, L. & Villani, C. (2002). The complexity of poverty: A missing component of educational leadership programs. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(3), 246-280.

Malarz, L. (1996). Using staff development to create inclusive schools. *Journal of Staff Development*. 17(3), 8-11.

Marshall, C. (1993). The politics of denial: Gender and race issues in administration. In C. Marshall (Ed.), *The new politics of race and gender: The 1992 yearbook of the Politics of Education Association* (pp. 168-174). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Mayrowetz, D. & Weinstein, C. (1999). Sources of leadership for inclusive education: Creating schools for all children. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 423-449.

McCarthy, M., Cambron-McCabe, N., & Thomas, S. (1998). *Public school law: Teachers' and students' rights.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

McIntosh, P. (2002). An archi-texture of learning disability services: The use of Michel Foucault. *Disability & Society, 17*(1), 65-79.

Miles, K. & Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Rethinking the allocation of teaching resources: Some lessons from high-performing schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 20*(1), pp. 9-29.

Murphy, J. (1999). *A quest for a center. (Monograph),* University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, J. (2001). *Re-culturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints.* Paper commissioned for the first meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation, Racine, WI.

Murphy, J. (2002a). Re-culturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 176-191.

Murphy, J. (2002b). Re-culturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century: 101st yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 65-82). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Odden, A. & Archibald, S. (2001). *Reallocating resources: How to boost student achievement without asking for more.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Pauken, P., Kallio, B.R., & Stockard, R. R. (2001). The ethics of public school fiscal and academic accountability legislation: A multidimensional analysis. *Journal of School Leadership 11*(3), 162-181.

Purpel, D. E. (1988). *The moral and spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice and compassion in education.* Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Quantz, R., Cambron-McCabe, N., & Dantley, M. (1991). Preparing school administrators for democratic authority: A critical approach to graduate education. *The Urban Review* 23(1), 3-19.

Reitzug, U. C. (1994). A case study of empowering principal behavior. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), 283-310.

Rice, S. & Ebmeier, H. (2002). Differentially weighting high school grades: A critique from the perspective of social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(3), 305-316.

Riester, A., Pursch, V. & Skrla, L. (2002). Principals for social justice: Leaders of school success for children from low-income homes. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(3), 281-304.

Rossman, G. (1992). *State policy for integrating all students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rude, H. A., & Anderson, R. E. (1992). Administrator effectiveness in support of inclusive schools. *Case In Point*, 7(1), 31-37.

S. Rep. No. 105-17, 1997.

Sailor, W. (1991). Special education in the restructured school. *Remedial and Special Education, 12*(6), 8-22.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1996). Full inclusion as disclosing tablet: Revealing the flaws in our present system. *Theory into Practice, 35*(1), 35-41.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). Organizations or Communities? Changing the Metaphor Changes the Theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(2), 214-237.

Shakeshaft, C. (1999). The struggle to create a more gender inclusive profession. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 99-118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shields, C., Larocque, L., & Oberg, S. (2002). A dialogue about race and ethnicity in education: Struggling to understand issues in cross-cultural leadership. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(2), 116-137.

University Council for Educational Administration (2001). A call for proposals. *UCEA Review 42*(1), 22-23.

Skrtic, T. M., 1991. *Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization*. Denver: Love Publishing Company.

Skrtic, T., Sailor, W., & Gee, K. (1996). Voice, collaboration, and inclusion: Democratic themes in educational and social reform initiatives. *Remedial and Special Education* 17(3), pp. 142-157.

Slavin, R. E. (1991). Synthesis of research of cooperative learning. *Educational Leadership 48*(5), 71-82.

Slee, R. & Weiner, G. (2001). Education reform and reconstruction as a challenge to research genres: Reconsidering school effectiveness research and inclusive schooling. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 12*(1), 83-98.

Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 51, 102-111.

Stainback, W. & Stainback, S. (1991). Promoting inclusive education: What happened in one school. *Quality Outcomes—Driven Education, 1*(3), 15-25.

Starratt, R. J. (2001) Democratic leadership theory in late modernity: an oxymoron or ironic possibility? *International Journal of Leadership in Education,* 4(4), 333-352.

Thousand, J. S. & Villa, R. A. (2000). Collaborative teaming: A powerful tool in school restructuring. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective*

education: Piecing the puzzle together (pp. 254-291). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Thousand, Nevin, & McNeil (2000). Achieving social justice through education for responsibility. In R. A. Villa & J. S. Thousand (Eds.), *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together* (pp. 137-165). Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

United States Department of Education (2000). *Twenty-second Annual Report.*

Villa, R. A. & Thousand, J. S. (2000). *Restructuring for caring and effective education: Piecing the puzzle together.* Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Villa, R., Thousand, J., Meyers, H., & Nevin, A. (1996). Teacher and administrator perceptions of heterogeneous education. *Exceptional Children, 63*(1), 29-45.

Wonycott-Kytle, A. and Bogotch, I. (2000). Measuring reculturing in national reform Models. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10(2), 131-157.

Young, M. & Laible, J. (2000). White racism, antiracism, and school leadership preparation. *Journal of School Leadership, 10*(5), 374-415.

Zepeda, S.J., & Langenbach, M. (1999). *Special programs in regular schools: Historical foundations, standards, and contemporary issues.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

---

[1] Additional variations of this paper are also available. See Murphy 1999, 2002a, and 2002b.

[2] Searches included truncated versions of school improvement, school effectiveness, and community, and excluded higher education.

[3] In 1992, several organizations adopted policy statements that support full inclusion along the lines of the reconceptualist perspective. These include the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Association of State Boards of Education. In 1993, other organizations aligned themselves with an incremental perspective. They adopted policies that support a continuum of service in which full inclusion is viewed as another placement option for each student. These organizations include the Council for Exceptional Children, the Learning Disabilities Association, and the National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities.

[4] In 1994, Sergiovanni suggested that educational leadership needed to change its foundational metaphor. Because the field emerged from organization theory, organization had been its metaphor since inception, but Sergiovanni argued, it was time to change. In place of the organization metaphor, he suggested community in which leaders lead democratically. Similarly, Murphy (1999; 2001) suggests democratic community as an anchor with the subsequent metaphor for leadership being community builder.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Inclusion: The unifying thread for fragmented metaphors.

Author(s): Lynn H. Doyle, Ph.D.

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: 4/20/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

[X] Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

[ ] Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

[ ] Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Lynn H. Doyle

Printed Name/Position/Title: Lynn H. Doyle, Assistant Professor

Organization/Address: Old Dominion University, Department of Educational Leadership, Darden College of Education - Room 110, Norfolk, VA 23529

Telephone: (757) 683-3373 FAX: (757) 683-5756

E-Mail Address: ldoyle

Date: 4/24/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions